UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/727,709	12/04/2000	Stacy Bryant	52493.000126	3945

	7590	02/24/2004

Hunton & Williams
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER
THAI, HANH B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2171	

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/727,709	BRYANT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hanh B Thai	2171	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Amendment 11/19/2003*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

This is in response to the Amendment filed November 19, 2003.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed November 19, 2003 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

Applicant states on page 17 that "the use of such preconfigured forms is not taught or

suggested by any of the cited prior art references" and on page 19 that "none of the cited

references teach or suggest the maintenance and updating of quote and broker information".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Northington teaches the graphic user interface forms for

entering the updated information in the predetermined format (see col. 7, line 45 to col.8, line 40

and col.10, lines 56-65, Northington). Please notes that the graphic user interface form for

account inquiry, reporting and maintenance have to have different predetermined format. Raveis,

Jr. is used as a secondary reference for the teaching of "quote and broker information".

Therefore, Northington and Raveis, Jr. combination teaches the claimed feature.

Applicant states on page 17 that "the rejection of claim 7 is improper for failing to

address each of the claims limitations". Examiner respectfully disagrees. Northington discloses

the Web interface using browser software (see col. 8, lines 7-18) and the "HTTP sevlet module"

must be included in that Web interface. Northington further teaches the form handler pages that

provide the graphic user interfaces (see col.10, lines 56-65, Northington). This corresponds to the

"forms generating means" for gathering information and must be preconfigured.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 7, 20, 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over

Northington et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,128,602) in view of Raveis, Jr. (U. S. patent no. 6,321,202).

2.   Regarding claims 1-3 and 22, Northington discloses a process for updating information

relating to administration of sales agents connected with a particular product or service (see col.

11, lines 40-59, Northington) comprising the steps of:

-       Selecting a sales-related database associated with a particular product or service

        (see col.7, lines 28-44 and 11, lines 40-59, Northington)

-       receiving updated information (see column 9, lines 42-48) for the sales-related

        database in a file configured in a predetermined format, the updated information

        comprising at least one of sales made by sales agents, brokers, distributors r

        dealers, commissions owed to sales agents, brokers, distributors of dealers,

        status of sales agents, brokers, distributors of dealers, and licensure status of

        sales agents, brokers, distributors or dealers, and being provided by a user

        interacting with an administrative tool having at least one broker operations

        module for updating broker information in the sales related database, a login

module (see col. 6, lines 52-60), a report builder module, a database access

module, and a file upload module having form generating means for presenting

the user with preconfigured forms for entering the updated information in the

predetermined format (see col. 7, lines 45-67 and col.10, lines 56-65,

Northington). Please notes that the graphic user interface form for account

inquiry, reporting and maintenance have to have different predetermined format;

- saving the configured file containing the updated information to the sales related

database (column 9, lines 49-58, Northington); and

- uploading the sales-related database to a web-based database using the

administrative tool. Northington teaches using "known in the art" programs to

accomplish uploading of data (see column 7, lines 45-53).

Northington does not explicitly disclose the "rate change module". But, Northington

discloses "credit rating" (see column 15, line 49, northington) and "financial

transaction...debit..credit" (see col. 16, lines 7-16, Northignton). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to include a "rate change module" for the credit rate changes

associated with product. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skilled

in the art at the time of the invention to use the rate change module and associate it with

the rating process in Northington. The motivation of doing so would have been to create

and debug software efficiently. Specially, it was well known that coding in modules

allows for parallel debugging, resulting better and less time.

Furthermore, Northington does not disclose "quote and broker information". Raveis, Jr.,

however, discloses the system and method for managing transactions relating t real estate

including the quote (quote 720, Fig.7) and broker information (see Fi.5, Fig.7 and corresponding text, Raveis). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to apply the quote and broker information of Raveis into the system of Northington. The motivation of doing so would have been to provide a novel system for managing real estate transactions in an efficient cost effective manner (see col. 4, lines 26-29, Raveis).

3.   Regarding claim 4, Northington disclose a system for performing functions relating to administration of sales agents, brokers, distributors or dealers connected with a sales-related database comprising:

a user-interactive administrative tool for providing updated information to a sales-related database, the administrative tool having at least one broker operations module for updating broker information in the sales related database, a rate change module, and at least one of:

-       "a user login module" for restricting access to the system (see col. 6, lines 52-60 and col. 10, line 66 to col. 11, line3, Northington);

-       "a database access" for accessing data stored in the sales-related database and for reading one or more configured files (see col. 8, lines 9-13); and

-       "a file upload" for uploading data to the sales-related database and the system (see column 7, lines 45-53).

Northington, however, does not explicitly disclose "access module" and "upload module". But, Northington teaches using "known in the art" programs to accomplish

uploading of data (see column 7, lines 45-53) and "levels of access" (see col. 2, lines 44-53, Northington). The examiner takes official notice that program modules for such a purpose were well known, and in fact contemplated by Northington's express suggestion. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use the well-known upload module and associate it with the upload process in Northington. The motivation of doing so would have been to create and debug software efficiently. Specially, it was well known that coding in modules allows for parallel debugging, resulting better and less time.

Furthermore, Northington does not disclose "quote and broker information". Raveis, Jr., however, discloses the system and method for managing transactions relating t real estate including the quote (quote 720, Fig.7) and broker information (see Fi.5, Fig.7 and corresponding text, Raveis). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to apply the quote and broker information of Raveis into the system of Northington. The motivation of doing so would have been to provide a novel system for managing real estate transactions in an efficient cost effective manner (see col. 4, lines 26-29, Raveis).

4.   Regarding claim 5, Northington further discloses the system comprising a report building module for presenting data in one or more predetermined formats, for generating one or more reports (see col. 8, lines 1-9), and for tracking access (see col. 8, lines 9-13) and navigation through the sales databases (see col. 8, lines 41-55, Nothington).

5.   Regarding claim 7, Northington discloses all of the claimed subject matter as discussed

above, except Northington does not disclose "HTTP servlet module". Northington, however,

discloses the Web interface using browser software (see col. 8, lines 7-18) and the "HTTP sevlet

module" must be included in that Web interface. Northington teaches the form handler pages that

provide the graphic user interfaces (see col.10, lines 56-65, Northington). This corresponds to the

"forms generating means" and must be preconfigured.

6.   Regarding claims 20 and 24, Northington discloses a process for updating information

relating to administration of sales agent, brokers, distributors or dealers in a sales-related

database comprising the steps of:

-       receiving an access request (see col. 6, lines 52-60 and col. 10, line 66 to col. 11,

        line3, Northington);

-       determining if the access request is valid (see col.), line 59 to col. 7, line4);

-       receiving updated information if the access request is valid, the updated

        information comprising at least one of sales made by sales agents commissions

        owed to sales agents (see being provided by a user interacting with an

        administrative tool having at least one broker operations module for updating

        broker information in the sales related database, a rate change module, and at

        least one of a login module, a report builder module, a broker operations

        module, a database access module, and file upload module (see column 9, lines

        42-48);

-       verifying the received updated information (see col.8, line 41 to col.9, line 48,

        Northington).

Northington, however, does not explicitly disclose "replicating the sales-related database". But, Northington discloses the data's uploads and downloads processing (see col. 7, lines 51-53, Northington). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to replicate database by downloading data. The examiner notes, by definition, as soon as the data is downloaded and or uploaded, and the process is completed the data has been replicated. The motivation of doing so would have been to transmit data to the users.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Northington et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,128,602) in view of Harris et al. (U. S. Patent no. 5,893,904).

7.   Regarding claim 6, Northington discloses all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above, except Northington does not disclose "broker module". Harris, however, discloses the sell module in which the sale is to be brokered (see column 17, lines 49-63 and 18, lines50-54). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teaching of Northington to include the broker module as taught by Harris. The motivation of doing so would have been for the entity in Northington's system to have the broker to find and identify the recipient of a transaction, sale or purchasing.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Northington et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,128,602) in view of Kappel (U. S. Patent no. 6,144,988).

8.   Regarding claim 8, Northington discloses all of the claimed subject matter as discussed

above, except Northington does not disclose "plurality of servlets". Kappel, however, discloses

multiple servlets (Processing Servlet and Offer Servlet, Fig. 4, Kappel). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Northington as

taught by Kappel to describe the communication over the web server (column 1, lines 44-46,

Kappel).

        Claims 9, 19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over

Northington et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,128,602) in view of O'Neil et al. (U. S. Patent no.

5,987,440).

9.   Regarding claims 9, 19 and 23, Northington discloses a process for performing functions

relating to administration of sales agents, brokers, distributors or dealers connected with a sales-

related database comprising the steps of:

-       receiving login information from a client system (see col. 6, lines 52-56,

        Northington);

-       determining if the login information is valid (see col. 6, lines 56-60);

-       transmitting an administrative functions home page to the client system if the

        login information is valid, the administrative functions home page being

        associated with an administrative tool having at least one of a login module, a

        report builder module, a broker operations module, a database access module,

        and a file upload module (column 6, line 56 to col. 7, line 4, Northington)

having form generating means for presenting the user with preconfigured forms

for entering the updated information in a predetermined format (see col. 7, lines

45-67 and col.10, lines 56-65, Northington). Northington teaches the graphic

user interface forms for entering the updated information in the predetermined

format. Please notes that the graphic user interface form for account inquiry,

reporting and maintenance have to have different predetermined format;

- receiving updated information in a predetermined format, the updated

    information being provided by a user interacting with the administrative tool

    (see col. 9, lines 42-48)

- updating the sales-related database to store the received updated information

    (see col. 9, lines 49-58, Northington).

Northington, however, does not explicitly disclose receiving a function link selection

from the client system, determining which function link was selected and displaying an

administrative function screen corresponding to the function link selected. O'Neil, on the other

hand, discloses the web links (see column 5, lines 51-61, O'Neil), the selected link and

displaying function screen by the "E-Metro Community administrator" on the "Netscape

Navigator". Therefore, the Community administrator handles the administrative function as

claimed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Northington to include the function links as taught by O'Neil. The

motivation of doing so would have been to process and display the requested information by the

users over the Internet.

Claims 10-12 and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over

Northington et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,128,602) in view of O'Neil et al. (U. S. Patent no.

5,987,440) and further view of Raveis (U. S. Parent no. 6,321,202).

10.   Regarding claims 10-11, Northington/ O'Neil combination discloses all of the claimed

subject matter as discussed above, except "field for entering information in broker information

screen". Raveis, however, discloses the detail broker information (see column 5, lines 8-20 and

Fig. 5, Raveis), displaying the broker information screen ("Microsoft Visual FoxPro", Fig. 4-5)

and updated information entered in at least one field (field 351, 352 or 354, Fig. 8A) in the

broker information screen. Please note that the "Microsoft Visual FoxPro" corresponds to

"broker information screen". It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at

the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Northington and O'Neil to include the broker

information links and screen associated with fields as taught by Raveis. The motivation of doing

so would have been to manage and globally distribute the brokers' information over the Internet.

11.   Regarding claim 12, Northington/O'Neil/Raveis combination discloses "broker public

key" for encryption purposes (see FIG. 4 and col. 9, lines 9-26, O'Neil).

12.   Regarding claims 13-18, Northington/O'Neil/Raveis combination discloses all of the

claimed subject matter as discussed above, except "report", "quote". It would have been obvious

to have this information in real estate services as evidenced by Raveis because these are the

elements of a complete "MORTGAGE" processing of Raveis' system (see "REAL ESTATE

SERVICES-MORTGAGE", Fig. 5, Raveis).

Conclusion

13.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

14.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Hanh B Thai whose telephone number is 703-305-4883. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Hanh Thai
Art Unit 2171
February 12, 2004

SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100